

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/510,884 01/03/2005		01/03/2005	Yury Alexeevich Gromakov	U 015285-7	6310		
140	7590	06/19/2006		EXAMINER			
LADAS & PARRY				KHAN, S	KHAN, SUHAIL		
26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2617	2617		
				DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

1,

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/510,884	GROMAKOV ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Suhail Khan	2617		

.	LAMITHE	ATT OTHE	
	Suhail Khan	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be 		ducina or simplifyina	the issues for
appeal; and/or		. , ,	uie issues ioi
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(DTOL 204)
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Devily proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	·	·	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatic REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	
13. Other:	,	2/1	
	-	CHAMILIANIAN ARRES APPLIAN	
	CH	IARLES APPIALI	

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that A) prior art does not disclose that a fragment of the map is sent to a mobile station and B) Grayson et al teaches away from the claims and that determination of communication parameters when transiting to another cell or system is performed on the mobile station is not taught by prior art. A) As shown in earlier office actions, in Soliman, figure 1 shows communication between mobile station and mobile switching center via base station. The mobile switching center is interpreted as being the control center. In page 2, paragraph 19, Soliman shows that the position database has map information depicting the coverage area of the first and second cells and the predetermined area. Page 2, paragraph 15, shows position equipment includes GPS, hence map is a digital - electronic file. Also, in page 9, paragraph 105, Soliman shows that the calculated position is sent from the BSC to the MSC or the wireless unit. B) The Grayson et al reference was used to show limitations not met by the primary reference of Soliman. Soliman does not disclose that 'the comparison of current data of its location and the coordinates of cell borders is carried out in the mobile station'. Grayson et al show the comparison of the mobile station's position vis-a-vis the current cell indicating that the mobile station is approaching the edge of the cell (page 6, paragraph 97). Also, in page 1, pargraph 11, Grayson et al also show that although the mobile station data is obtained from a navigation apparatus, the mobile station could also perform the functions of a navigation apparatus. Further, It is well known to transfer functionality between two different elements, in this instance, between the mobile station and the satellite access node. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQZd 1596 (Fed. Cir.1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQZd 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).